PARTICIPATORY SERVICE-LEARNING AND IDENTITY IN INTERCOLLEGIATE FORENSICS ORGANIZATIONS

by

Robyn A. Moreno

A thesis submitted to the faculty of
The University of Utah
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

Department of Communication

The University of Utah

August 2014

The University of Utah Graduate School

STATEMENT OF THESIS APPROVAL

The thesis of **Robyn A. Moreno**

has been approved by the following supervisory committee members:

Ann Darling	, Chair	**5/9/2014** Date Approved
Leonard Hawes	, Member	**5/9/2014**
Michael Middleton	, Member	**5/9/2014** Date Approved

and by **Kent A. Ono**, Chair/Dean of

the Department/College/School of **Communication**

and by David B. Kieda, Dean of The Graduate School.

ABSTRACT

One of the most significant ways to address the ongoing problem of college student dropout is through student engagement. Student engagement includes institutional access to and participation in educationally purposeful activities. When educationally purposeful activities are combined with opportunities for academic integration the outcomes for students are significant. A productive space for combining educationally purposeful activities and academic integration is academic organizations. Through processes of organizational identification that involve participation in educationally purposeful activities, members of academic organizations become academically integrated.

Although it seems clear that participation in educationally purposeful activities within academic organizations produces significant positive outcomes for students, it is unclear how these activities trigger organizational identity development. This thesis examined a specific set of educationally purposeful activities within the context of an intercollegiate debate organization to facilitate a contextual understanding of how different activities interact with organizational identification. It sought to explore how the processes of engaging in various educationally purposeful activities are descriptive of undergraduate students' identification with academic organizations by revealing the complex and dynamic individual-organization sense making in which these students engaged.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Appendices

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Going to college is not the same as being successful in college. Unfortunately, a significant number of students who begin college leave before completing degrees. For decades the college student graduation rate has hovered around 50% (Kuh, Kinzie, Schuh & White, 2010). The consequences of this high drop-out rate are significant. The benefits of a baccalaureate degree or higher are well established; individuals with college degrees have higher employment rates, higher lifetime earnings, and more opportunity for social and economic mobility (Brand & Xie, 2010; Kruegar, 2012). Benefits of a college degree are not only economic; degree holders are healthier, happier, and more satisfied with their jobs (Mirowsky & Ross, 2003; Oreopoulos & Salvanes, 2011).

The general and underlying causes that lead to drop out statistics in higher education are complex. Several areas of research seek to better understand the causes and consequences of students' success in college including: student background characteristics, structural characteristics of institutions, interactions with faculty and staff members and peers, student perceptions of the learning environment, and the quality of effort students devote to educationally purposeful activities (Kuh, Cruce, Shoup, Kinzie & Gonyea, 2008). Tinto's (1993) theory of college student departure, which stressed the importance of support from institutions of higher education, is one of the most widelycited the theories on educational persistence. He suggested that above all other

factors, students who are successfully integrated into an institution are less likely to leave.

Student entry characteristics, for example, family background characteristics, socioeconomic status, and parental education level, may have some initial effect on persistence and success in college but several researchers, along with Tinto (1993), have suggested that what students do when they get to college is more consequential to their success (Braxton, Vesper, & Hossler, 1995; Kuh et. al, 2010; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1980). When students drop out of school, do not do well academically, or are unsatisfied with school, it is because they are not successfully integrated into academic and social communities within the institution. Many students who struggle in college experience universities as isolated learners whose learning experiences are disconnected from others and this disconnect may be one of the leading causes of college student drop out (Tinto, 1993).

Empirical evidence from several studies has suggested that student engagement in the college environment is one of the most important factors contributing to success in college (Zhao & Kuh, 2004). Student involvement and engagement in college has been associated with success and retention (Astin, 1993; Zhao & Kuh, 2004). An engaged student is someone who devotes considerable time to studying, spends much time on campus, participates actively in student organizations, and interacts frequently with faculty members and other students (Cabrera, Casteneda, & Hengstler, 1992). A study by Braxton and colleagues (1995) found that all factors that contributed to students remaining in college suggested involvement whereas all that contributed to students dropping out implied a lack of involvement. It is therefore an essential part of the college

experience for students to receive support for involvement within the institution. Support from student groups, faculty, and other campus resources are signs that students are integrated into the college community and are less likely to leave college (Tinto, 1993).

Student engagement has two key components that contribute to student success. The first is the amount of time and effort students put into their studies and other activities that lead to the experiences and outcomes that constitute student success. Educationally purposeful activities have been shown to produce outcomes key to success such as grades and persistence (Kuh et al, 2008). Educationally purposeful activities are participatory activities within academic contexts that encourage engagement, including group work, debate, and teaching (Wenger, McDermott, & Snyder, 2002). The second component of student engagement are the ways that the institution allocates resources and organizes learning opportunities to induce students to participate in and benefit from such activities (Kuh et. al, 2010).

Learning opportunities that produce the most significant outcomes are those that encourage academic integration (Kuh et. al, 2010). Academic integration refers to processes by which students adjust to college life academically. According to Kuh, Kinzie, Buckley, Bridges and Hayek, 2006, "academic integration represents both satisfactory compliance with explicit norms, such as earning passing grades, and the normative academic values of the institution, such as an engineering school that values the physical sciences over the arts" (p. 16). Research suggests that academic integration happens most easily when students are involved in and become members of academic organizations on campus because they promote academic and social integration in the same context (Braxton et al, 1995). This is significant because academic and social

integration are complementary processes that support student engagement (Kuh et al, 2006). There are many types of academic organizations in higher education, some include: learning communities, student government, service learning groups, debate teams, and academically focused residence halls.

This paper focuses on academic organizations in higher education because they bring together the two key components of student engagement. They describe resources on campus that induce engagement and academic integration because they are spaces that allow for identification with and participation within the university. Specifically, they are academically focused organizations that typically engage in one or more educationally purposeful activities. Understanding the ways that participation in educationally purposeful activities interacts with organizational identification within academic organizations is important in understanding student engagement because research suggests that identification with an academic organization promotes academic integration, which is an imperative component of college student persistence (O'Reilly & Chatman, 1986).

Before discussing theories and practices of identity within organizations, it is important to understand the relationship between educationally purposeful activities and college success. This relationship is well established and research suggests that the more students are involved, the more they gain from college (Zao & Kuh, 2004). Frequent interaction with educationally purposeful activities is related to greater self-reported gains in personal and social development, practical competence and general education, and more frequent use of deep approaches to learning (Gordon, Habley, and Grites, 2011). Research links student engagement in activities that contribute to learning and personal

development to significant outcomes including, higher grade point averages, higher rates of graduation, and more meaningful college experiences (Astin, 1993; Croucher, Long Meredith, Oomen, & Steele, 2009; Zao & Kuh, 2004). Positive outcomes also tend to extend beyond the college experience. Participation in educationally purposeful activities during college correlates with better career experiences following graduation including higher career earnings (Croucher et al., 2009).

Educationally purposeful activities offer opportunities for students to take responsibility for their own learning through participation in activities and events that enrich their educational experience. However, not all educationally purposeful activities and experiences are the same. Research suggests that some are more likely to foster desired results. Specifically, educationally purposeful activities that take place within the context of an academic group or organization have been shown to produce more robust outcomes (Astin, 1993; Chickering & Reisser, 1993). For example, Kuh (1993) suggested that living in an academic theme residence hall is associated with gains in critical thinking, intellectual development, and aesthetic appreciation. Involvement in student government has also been linked to positive outcomes such as gains in student understanding and appreciation of human differences. Groups such as these incorporate active and collaborative learning activities and promote involvement in complementary academic and social activities that extend beyond the classroom (Zhao & Kuh, 2004). These approaches have been linked to positive behaviors such as increased academic effort and outcomes including promoting diversity, social tolerance, and personal and interpersonal development (Zhao & Kuh 2004). In addition, students who actively participate in various educationally purposeful activities within the context of an

organization are more likely to identify with a group of peers and/or the organization in which they participate. Identification with academic organizations is also important for student retention, success, and personal development (Astin, 1993; Tinto, 1993).

As suggested earlier, identification with an academic organization contributes to academic integration. Theories of organizational identification suggest that one's self-concept is largely created through group affiliation and membership. People attach significant meaning to their relationships with organizations and salient identification with an organization can have significant impact on an individual (Edwards & Peccei, 2010). For example, students who strongly identify with an institution of higher education and/or a group within the institution are more satisfied with and committed to their education, have higher rates of graduation, better grades, and are more dedicated to the organization over time (Bartels, Peters, de Jong, Pruyn & Van der Molen, 2010; O'Reilly & Chatman, 1986; Tinto, 1997). Though individuals derive a varying sense of self from the groups to which they belong, for many, organizational identity can be more important than recognized identity qualities such as age, race, sex, ethnicity, and nationality (Edwards & Peccei, 2010).

Activities and organizational roles within academic organizations can carry powerful implications for shaping attitudes, beliefs, motivation and identification (Edwards & Peccei, 2010). Educationally purposeful activities offer necessary opportunities for identification. Research suggests that there is a causal relationship between activities performed within an organization and level of identification with the organization. Organizations provide contexts in which individuals express and negotiate identities in an immediate and tangible form through the activities in which they

participate (Gerger, Cunningham, & Drumwright, 2006). Scott, Corman, and Cheney (1998) suggested that one's daily routines, specifically related to the activities one regularly participates in within organizations, provide the context necessary for identifications to be made.

Although it seems clear that participation in educationally purposeful activities within academic organizations produces significant positive outcomes for students, for example, higher grades and persistence, it is unclear how, specifically, these activities trigger organizational identity development. Academic organizations provide particularly useful contexts in which to explore this relationship because many of them incorporate participatory activities that can be constructed as educationally purposeful. These activities offer opportunities for organizational members to produce and reproduce identification with the organization. For example, as students participate in organizational activities their interaction with group members, and group goals and initiatives, create spaces for them to feel connected to the group and to be recognized by other group members. This allows them to develop their own identity as a group member. Investigating specific educationally purposeful activities within an academic organization will help develop a more nuanced understanding of the ways different activities affect organizational identification.

This thesis examined a specific set of educationally purposeful activities within the context of an intercollegiate debate organization to facilitate a contextual understanding of how different activities interact with organizational identification. It sought to explore how the processes of engaging in various educationally purposeful activities are descriptive of undergraduate students' identification with an academic

organization by revealing the complex and dynamic individual-organization sense making in which these students engaged. Clarification of the details and nuances of different activities within this context will add to the rigor and quality of research on college student success and will offer clarity and explication of student involvement in academic organizations within higher education for scholarship, policy and practice.

An intercollegiate debate organization provided a relevant context in which to explore the relationship between educationally purposeful activities and organizational membership because the undergraduate students that participate in the debate organization become members of a community focused on academic content that engages with several specific educationally purposeful activities. These activities include, teaching and coaching, participating in competition, judging academic debates, and many forms of group and team-work. This atmosphere enables students to develop their identity and discover their voice as organizational members as well as to integrate what they are learning into their worldview and other academic and social experiences.

In summary, research suggests that one of the most significant ways to address the ongoing problem of college student dropout is through student engagement (Astin, 1993; Tinto, 1993; Zhao & Kuh, 2004). Student engagement includes institutional access to and participation in educationally purposeful activities. Scholars suggest when educationally purposeful activities are combined with opportunities for academic integration the outcomes for students are significant (Kuh et al, 2008). One of the most productive spaces for combining educationally purposeful activities and academic integration is in academic organizations (Braxton et al., 1995). Through processes of organizational identification that involve participation in educationally purposeful activities, members of

academic organizations become academically integrated (O'Reilly & Chatman, 1986). This study focused on the activities performed within an intercollegiate debate organization in order to explore how different activities interact with organizational identification.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Organizational Identification

In order to understand the ways in which students understand and make sense of their participation in educationally purposeful activities and how those activities interact with organizational identification, it is useful to begin with a review of the literature in organizational identification and to explore social identity theory as a way to operationalize identification within organizational contexts. Following this review, I consider how educationally purposeful activities contribute to organizational identification. This will create context for the study and a foundation of literature that supports further exploration of the ways in which different participatory activities interact with organizational identification.

The study of organizational identification is cross-disciplinary and borrows from rhetorical, psychological, and anthropological perspectives (Croucher et al., 2009). Organizational identity has been recognized as a critical construct affecting both the satisfaction of the individual and the effectiveness of an organization (Ashforth & Mael, 1989). Lei, Loi and Lam (2011) defined organizational identification as a perception of oneness with, or belongingness to, an organization. Likewise, Ashforth, Harrison, andCorley (2008) described organizational identification as a continuing process that involves the interplay between individuals and organizations. Pratt (2008) described

organizational identification as the alignment of individual and group values. Communication scholars have furthered the definition of organizational identity and organizational identification to include the messages about what the organization "is," "stands for" or "wants to be" as communicated to an outside audience by its members (Croucher et al, 2009).

Organizational identification is important as a field of research and is specifically relevant to this study for several reasons. Ashforth et al. (2008) suggest that organizational identification is important to concepts of self-identity because it is one significant way that people come to define themselves, make sense of their place in the world and appropriately navigate their lives. In addition, they suggest that there is an inherent need for humans to identify with and feel part of larger groups. Identifying with an organization is one way in which humans fulfill this need and is a relevant and productive context in which to conduct research that will support developing a more comprehensive understanding of this phenomenon.

Organizational identification is also important because there is a relationship between identification with and commitment to the organization. High levels of organizational identification, or commitment, are associated with positive outcomes for work attitudes and behaviors including, motivation, job performance and satisfaction, individual decision-making and member interaction and retention (Ashforth et al., 2008; Cheney, 1983; Scott et al., 1998). Member satisfaction and retention has direct implications for productivity, efficiency, effectiveness, and for the overall success of an organization (Cheney, 1983). For example, Mael and Ashforth (1992) found that the identification of alumni with their alma mater predicted their donating to that institution,

their recruiting of offspring and others, their attendance at functions and their satisfaction with the alma mater. Additionally, links have been made between organizational identification and other positive organizational behaviors including leadership, perceptions of justice and the meaning of work (Ashforth et al., 2008).

Conceptualizations of organizational identification began when scholars broadened thinking about self-identity and identification in general (Tompkins, 2005). Scholars began to recognize symbolic linkages (through communication) as important aspects of the process of identification (Cheney & Tompkins, 1987). The recognition that processes of organizational identification occur largely through language as one expresses similarities to or affiliations with particular groups, including organizations, became a significant focus of scholarship and lead to the broadening of organizational identification research (Cheney & Tompkins, 1987).

O'Reilly and Chatman (1986) engaged organizational identification in terms of affective and motivational processes. They argued that organizational identification emerges from attraction and desire to maintain an emotionally satisfying, self-defining relationship with an organization. O'Reilly and Chatman (1989) suggested that the most thorough definition of organizational identification would conceptualize it as a perceptual link to an organization. Group members create this link through various cognitive and affective processes that occur as members and the organization, including all its constituents, interact (O'Reilly & Chatman, 1986).

Much of the current research on organizational identification builds on the ideas proposed by Albert and Whetton (1985) and Ashforth and Mael (1989) which consider organizational identity as a relational construct formed in interaction with others. Albert

and Whetton (1985) constructed their ideas on organizational identification by considering the findings about identity construction initially proposed by Erickson in 1968. They considered Erickson's analysis of identity construction as a series of comparisons (pp. 265):

1) Outsiders compare target individuals within the organization with themselves;
2) Information regarding this interaction is communicated through conversations between parties and the individual considers this feedback by making personal comparisons with outsiders, which then;
3) affects how they define themselves.

Albert and Whetton (1985) concluded that an individual's identification with an organization "is formed by a process of ordered inter-organizational comparisons and reflections upon them over time" (pp. 267).

Social Identity Theory

Identity and identification are fundamental constructs in organizational phenomena and underlie many observable organizational behaviors (Albert, Ashforth, & Dutton, 2000). In order to understand identification, identity must first be understood (Ashforth et al., 2008). Social identity research is one of several areas of scholarship that attempts to understand identity. Social identity is the part of an individual's self-concept that is acquired from knowledge of membership in a social group(s) along with the value and emotional significance attached to that membership (Albert et al., 2000).

Organizational identification is a form of social identification. Individuals view their affiliations with organizations as important aspects of their own self-concept or personal identity (Cheney, Christensen, Zorn, & Ganesh, 2004; Lei et al., 2011). Social

Identity Theory (SIT) suggests that people tend to organize and situate themselves and others in social categories and organizational memberships such as, religious affiliation, political party, gender, age cohort, etc. (Tajfel & Turner, 1985). SIT posits that this type of classification helps individuals cognitively divide and organize their social environment which subsequently provides them with a systematic means of defining others.

Classifying others enables individuals to situate themselves in their social environment. SIT suggests that individuals define themselves in relation to individuals in other categories (Rooney et al., 2010). Once people have categorized others they can categorize themselves and make comparisons. As Ashforth and Mael (1989) put it, "the self-concept is comprised of a personal identity encompassing idiosyncratic characteristics and a social identity encompassing salient group classifications" (pp. 212).

In essence, SIT describes the continuous, delicate balance between being both distinctive and nondistinctive as a member of a group yet distinct enough to be recognized as an individual (Brown & Starkey, 2000). From this perspective, identity does not reside in the minds of individuals; rather, it resides among and between people, visible in their actions and communication (Hatch & Shultz, 2002). Maintaining this balance is an ongoing and continuously changing communicative process that individuals engage within the context of organizations (Rooney et al, 2010).

The relevance of SIT in organizational contexts has been well-established by identity researchers and increasingly indicates that individuals form their identities based on organizational and workgroups much more than their personal lives (Rooney et al, 2010; Scott, 1995). Applying the principles of SIT to organizational identification

provides a productive way to understand issues of identity and identification as they relate to organizations (Brown, 2007). SIT assists in combining the cognitive elements of organizational identification and the affective and evaluative components of organizational identification and the affective and evaluative components of organizational membership. For example, emotional attachment, feelings of pride and other positive emotions that are derived from organizational membership have been incorporated in the operationalization of organizational identification (Cheney, 1983). SIT proposes that people's psychological connections to their teams, professions and organizations contribute to and enhance a positive sense of self (Ashforth & Mael, 1989).

SIT literature suggests several specific consequences that are relevant to organizations. The process of identification typically prompts individuals to align themselves with organizations that engage in activities that resonate with salient aspects of their identities and to support organizations that represent those identities (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Rooney et al, 2010). Therefore, identification with an organization suggests support for and commitment to the organization. Members of an organization that identify strongly with the group express loyalty to and pride in the group and its activities. For example, Stryker and Serpe (1982) found that individuals for whom a religious role was salient, reported spending more time in that role and deriving satisfaction from it.

Organizational members that experience salient identification with the group may also have direct and/or vicarious involvement in its successes and failures (Ashforth & Mael, 1989). Postmes (2003) stated "perceptions of shared social identity provide people with multiple motivations for communicating and also with a shared cognitive framework

that allows this communication to be mutually beneficial and productive" (pp. 86). Considering the integration of SIT and communication in identity based research is especially promising for a better understanding of vital issues related to identification in organizations (Ashforth & Johnson, 2001).

The student attrition model developed by Bean (1983) suggested that beliefs shape attitudes, attitudes shape behaviors, and behaviors signal intents. Bean concluded that a student's beliefs are affected by experiences with an institution, which then evolve into attitudes about the institution which eventually determine a student's identification with the institution. This suggests that considering organizational identification through the lens of SIT is particularly relevant in understanding student engagement in academic organizations.

Participation and Organizational Identity

Wenger (1998) suggested that a central source of identity formation in organizations is participation. Identities are constructed and strengthened by established and stable communities and the social processes generated within them (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Rooney et al, 2010). Wenger, McDermott and Snyder (2002) suggest that one significant way individuals form identity in an organization is through participation and participatory activities within the organization. Identity is constituted through the recognition of mutuality in relations of participation (Wenger, 1998). Identity is also socially defined through participation and reification in organizations and constructed through negotiation of meaning (Wenger et al., 2002). Processes of participation provide the experiences and material that are necessary for building identities individually and collectively (Wenger, 1998). For example, in a 2001 study, Billet (2001) found that

participants who had more experiences in participatory activities within the organization he examined reported the strongest development of identification with the organization and described higher quality of experiences.

Participatory Practices and Educational Organizations

Literature on educationally purposeful engagement in higher education aligns with the suggestion that participatory involvement in an organization is associated with positive organizational identification as well as positive student outcomes (Ashforth et al, 2008; Rogers, 2002; Tinto, 1997; Zhao & Kuh, 2004). Engagement describes the active involvement in the mutual processes of negotiating and enabling access to participation (Wenger et al., 2002). Zhao and Kuh (2004) suggest that student engagement in participatory activities inside and outside the classroom correlates to higher levels of student learning and personal development. Undergraduate students who affiliate themselves with and actively participate in organizations that provide educationally engaging experiences have higher rates of retention, success and personal development (Rogers, 2005; Zhao & Kuh, 2004).

Tinto (1997) suggested that there is growing recognition that student learning is enhanced when students are actively involved in learning and when they are placed in situations in which they have to share learning in some positive connected manner. In several studies conducted by Tinto, students who reported greater involvement in the range and extent of academic and social activities on campus also reported greater perceived developmental gains over the course of a year. In addition, they reported significantly more positive views of the college, its students and faculty, its classes and climate, and their own involvement in the college (Tinto, 1997; Tinto & Goodsell-Love,

1993). SIT would suggest that these positive outcomes are in part due to salient identifications that students have formed with the academic organizations of which they are members.

Participation in a collaborative, academic group as an undergraduate student provides students the opportunity to develop a supportive community of peers. Such relationships help students connect to the broader social communities of the college while also engaging them in the academic life of the institution (Tinto & Goodsell-Love, 1993). In other words, collaborative groups are a context in which students can build positive, productive identifications with academic organizations. For example, Richardson, Long and Woodly (2003) found that students who participated in group research programs reported direct, positive effects to their sense of identity and the way in which they engaged with supporting activities.

In summary, social identification is an important aspect of an individual's development of self or personal identity (Albert et al., 2000). Organizational identification is a form of social identification that allows individuals to situate themselves in and become connected to their social environment (Rooney et al., 2010). SIT suggests that processes of social identification prompt individuals to align themselves with organizations that resonate with salient aspects of their identities (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Rooney et al., 2010). Once aligned with an organization, participation in organizational activities is central to developing a salient identification with the organization (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Rooney et al, 2010; Wenger, 1998). Becoming integrated into an academic community during college has been demonstrated to be one of the most significant factors in predicting college student success (Braxton et

al., 1995; Kuh et al., 2010). As such, this thesis examined a specific set of educationally purposeful activities within the context of an intercollegiate debate organization to facilitate a contextual understanding of how different activities interact with individual sense making and organizational identification.

Forensics Teams as Participatory Organizations

American liberal education has long recognized intercollegiate speech and debate (forensics) as both a competitive and academic activity (Freely & Steinberg, 2000). Debate is an excellent example of a practice that promotes student learning and implements successful approaches to student engagement (Snider & Schnurer, 2002). Members of intercollegiate forensics teams learn valuable speech and debate skills and develop better overall cognitive learning skills through the participatory practices in which they engage (Aden, 2002; Rogers, 2002; Snider & Schnurer, 2002). Membership in debate organizations is correlated with many positive outcomes, including higher rates of voting, greater volunteerism, increased tolerance, and overall higher grade point averages (Rogers, 2002; Rogers, 2005; Snider & Schnurer, 2002). In more recent research by Rogers (2005), he concluded that forensics participation during the subject population's undergraduate experiences led to sustained, significant positive life outcomes beyond graduation.

Individuals who participate in intercollegiate forensics are socialized into a community (Croucher et al., 2009). This socialization into the debate organization has a deep influence on the individual's sense of self and identity. Croucher, Thornton and Eckstein (2006) found that identification with an on-campus speech and debate organization was positively correlated with students' overall motivation to perform the

roles required of them by the forensics team. Lei, Loi and Lam (2011) explained that while individuals try to include aspects of the organization into their own sense of self, organizations also encourage such identity enactment through individual's performances within the organization. Performing the roles that are required by membership in an organization is an important part of the process of organizational identification. In the case of intercollegiate debate organizations, participating in the various aspects of team membership, for example, practice, competition and service work, constitute the "roles" that organizational members are required to perform.

Hui, Law and Chen (1999) suggested that individuals who possess high levels of organizational identification are willing to make greater efforts in their in-role performance. Individuals who maintain high levels of identification with the organization typically attach a great deal of importance to their organizational membership (Lei et al., 2011). The positive relationship between organizational identification and an individual's role performance is well documented (Ashorth et al., 2008; Hui, Law, & Chen 1999). Individuals who actively engage in the performative aspects of organizational socialization processes are more likely to have a salient identification with the organization (Lei et al., 2011). Consequently, organizational roles can convey powerful implications for shaping attitudes, beliefs and motivation of members (Cheney et al., 2004).

Intercollegiate debate organizations are academic organizations that promote student engagement, and as a result college student persistence, because they interact with educationally purposeful activities and encourage academic integration through organizational membership. This type of organization provides a productive context to

explore the ways in which different educationally purposeful activities affect organizational identification which will lead to a more nuanced understanding of student engagement. Such a nuanced understanding, one that focuses on the communicative experiences of students involved in an organizational identification process will expand knowledge of how students make sense of their own identification processes and help educational institutions structure educationally purposeful activities that enhance engagement and diminish the likelihood of dropping out of college.

Research Question

The purpose of the study was to expose the communicative strategies and tactics that undergraduate students use to manage and develop identification with academic organizations in order to inform understanding of the ways in which different educationally purposeful activities affect identification with the organization (Larsen & Pepper, 2003). Developing and understanding of practices of organizational identification within this context will lead to a more nuanced understanding of student engagement and academic integration which are important components of college student persistence and success. The primary question guiding the research was, *how do students make sense of their engagement in educationally purposeful activities and how does that sense making reveal aspects of organizational identification in action?*

CHAPTER 3

THE JOHN R. PARK DEBATE SOCIETY

The John R. Park Debate Society is the University of Utah's speech and debate team and is currently sponsored by and housed in the University's Department of Communication. It is located on the main campus of the University of Utah, which sits at the base of the Wasatch Mountains in Salt Lake City, Utah. The University of Utah is a research-oriented institution and the John R. Park Debate Society has been a part of the institution even before its official founding in 1896. As such, the John R. Park Debate Society is one of the oldest intercollegiate debate organizations in the Western United States, with a long tradition of competitive success and a rich history both on campus and in the community.

The John R. Park Debate Society has been a campus organization since 1885 when the first president of the University of Utah, John R. Park, took the then student led organization and placed it under the control of the faculty in the Department of English. Through the years, the Debate Society evolved in many ways, but throughout the changes it consistently remained committed to the disciplined study of argumentation, public dialogue, and competitive success. It continues to support the academic success of students in all areas of study, promotes social responsibility and civic engagement in the broader community, and enriches public discourse about contemporary controversies. For

these reasons, the John R. Park Debate Society provides a productive organizational space in which to explore identification based on the opportunity for educationally purposeful engagement that it offers to undergraduate students at the University of Utah.

In addition to competitive forensics activities, the John R. Park Debate Society's signature contribution is its public outreach efforts. This outreach includes both public debates and service in local high schools. First, the team hosts public debates each semester that are relevant to the local and state-wide community. Second, the team pursues service learning by providing instructional support and coaching resources to local high schools. Undergraduate students on the team support local schools through free judging at tournaments and volunteer coaching for schools with limited resources. Jones and Abes (2004) discussed service learning as a contextual influence on identity development within organizations. A growing body of research has demonstrated the relationship between identity development, the development of citizenship, and the pedagogical aspects of service learning (Jones & Abes, 2004). Service learning informs the identity construction process by assisting participants in generating ongoing reflection about the self in relation to the other (Baxter Magolda, 1999; Youniss & Yates, 1997). Service learning also provides a context that assists students in developing a way to internally define their identity rather than relying on others to form it for them (Baxter Magolda, 2000; Jones & Hill, 2001).

In October 2013, the John R. Park Debate Society added to its outreach program and efforts by implementing and hosting bi-annual forensics workshops for high school students on the University of Utah's main campus. These workshops were designed to offer access to forensics coaching, evidence and materials, and a supportive environment for underserved students in the local high school forensics community. Undergraduate

student members of the John R. Park Debate Society engage with service learning in the workshops by coaching, teaching, and interacting with the high school students in group and one-on-one contexts. Wenger et al. (2002) suggested that students find relevance for learning through the obvious applicability of their knowledge. This new outreach effort provided a productive context in which to evaluate the ways that applying forensics knowledge through teaching informs processes of identity construction by the undergraduate student members of the John R. Park Debate Society.

Two workshops were held during the 2013-14 school year on the University of Utah main campus. A Fall workshop took place in October 2013 at the beginning of the high school debate season and a Spring workshop was held in February 2014 just before the regional and state debate competitions took place for Utah high schools. These dates were specifically selected with the intent of supporting high school programs as they began their competitive seasons in the fall and offer assistance during their preparation for final competitions at the end of their seasons. Both workshops were advertised to the local high school debate community via email messages sent to a list serve comprised of local high school coaches. The October workshop had 83 high school participants and the February workshop had 114 participants. Workshop attendance was capped at 100 (although a slight exception was made for the February group) due to limited availability of space on campus and number of workshop staff. The high school students represented at the workshops came from a range of local schools (see Appendix A for a listing).

The workshops were divided into three sections based on style of debate, these sections were: Cross Examination, Lincoln-Douglas, and Public Forum. Two undergraduate student volunteers were assigned to each section along with a member of the John R. Park Debate Society's coaching staff for support and supervision. The

workshops were held after high school hours from 4:00 - 7:00 PM and each section followed a similar order of events that included a lecture, drills for high school students, a short break for dinner (pizza and drinks were provided free of charge to all workshop participants), and finally a demonstration debate (see Appendix B for the Workshop Schedule).

The undergraduate student volunteers were engaged in a number of activities before and during the workshops. In preparation for the workshops students developed lesson plans and curriculum for use in the section of the workshop to which they were assigned (see Appendix C for a sample curriculum). The lesson plans they created were detailed and included a timed schedule for the evening, prepared lectures, group activities, and a demonstration debate. At the workshops, undergraduate student volunteers were in charge of running each section, this included being responsible for managing the high school students, delivering the lectures, facilitating group activities, performing a demonstration debate, and keeping the workshop on schedule. The John R. Park Debate Society's coaching staff offered support in the creation of the materials for the workshop and were present during the workshops, but the responsibility was largely placed on the undergraduate students.

CHAPTER 4

STUDY METHODS

Qualitative case study research served as an appropriate methodology for engaging the questions posed in this study. Case study research is especially useful in answering explanatory or "how" types of questions. The purpose of this research is to discover and describe the ways in which students make meaning out of their experiences in this educationally engaging practice and how those meanings reveal an emerging organizational identification, therefore case study research served as an appropriate methodology for this study. This section describes the overall research project from which this case was drawn, reviews the framework used to guide the study, explains how interviews and observations were used to gather data, and finally provides details about how the data were analyzed.

Constructivist Framework

A constructivist framework was used to guide the methods of this study. Constructivism theorizes how individuals construct meanings and recognizes that knowledge is created through interactions between and among individuals and their contexts. Constructivism relies on a relativist ontology, which accepts multiple realities and a subjectivist epistemology, which emphasizes a process of co-creating knowledgerather than the discovery of truth (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000). A constructivist

approach was fitting for this study because of the importance of participants' constructions of the meaning they make of their service-learning experiences, the nature of the context in which these experiences will be situated, and their evolving understanding of the self and the organization in which the activities were situated (Guba & Lincoln, 1994).

Integrating the diverse activities that members of the John R. Park Debate Society engage with academically and socially into a meaningful whole is required to convert their experience into identification with the organization (Zhao & Kuh, 2004). In this way, this study operationalized a constructivist approach to knowledge, whereby knowledge is not simply "discovered" rather, it is socially constructed. Members of the John R. Park Debate Society actively construct and assimilate knowledge through a reciprocal process that incorporates engagement in various activities. As a result, learning is deeper, more personally relevant and becomes part of who the student is, not just something the student has. This study sought to encourage students to reflect on the activities they participate in as members of the John R. Park Debate Society while considering the implications these activities have on organizational identification. This process of reflection asks students to construct meaning about their membership in the organization.

Study Participants

The participants in this study were 6 undergraduate members of the John R. Park Debate Society who were selected to teach in both of the workshops held during the 2013-14 school year. They were chosen by the coaching staff of the John R. Park Debate Society based on their knowledge and skill in debate and perceived ability to effectively

interact with and teach high school students. The students were not paid for their participation in the workshop or the study, but time they spent preparing for and teaching in the workshops counted toward their high school outreach volunteer requirement; all members of the John R. Park Debate Society are required to volunteer 15 hours per semester in the high school outreach program. There were several specific responsibilities that the undergraduate students had that contributed to the workshops and fulfilled their required volunteer hours in addition to the actual time spent teaching in the workshops. With the help of the John R. Park Debate Society's coaching staff, they developed lesson plans that included a lecture, drills for the high school students and a demonstration debate.

The primary goal of this research project was to speak with undergraduate student members of the John R. Park Debate Society regarding their experiences in the participatory practices they engaged as members of the organization with a specific focus on volunteer teaching in the context of the workshops. As such, each participant was an active member of the John R. Park Debate society and enrolled full time at the University of Utah during the research process. The 6 participants included in the project included a diversity of gender identities, religious affiliations, socioeconomic standings, and racial and ethnic backgrounds. They represent multiple personalities and positionalities. The age range of participants was 18-22. Class standings included freshman and juniors, although for some it is difficult to state the exact year in college because students themselves are unaware of their class standing and number of years in school does not always equate to class standing. Participation in the workshops was required by organizational membership, but participation in this study was not. However, all

undergraduate students who taught in the workshops were willing to sit down with me and discuss their experiences related to the workshop and as members of the John R. Park Debate Society. Participant responses were made in confidence and therefore I have identified them throughout the writing of this thesis by pseudonyms.

Data Collection

The data analyzed in this case were collected through participant observations during two high school forensics workshops, as well as through interviews conducted with undergraduate members of the John R. Park Debate Society who participated in teaching at the high school workshops. These methods are complementary in qualitative research because they assist the researcher in developing a more complex understanding of the data collected. Interviews provide in-depth conversations that encourage an open and reflective dialog about student experience while observations assist in providing the contextual information needed to frame the interviews and make sense of the data collected during the interviews (Polkinghorne, 2005).

Throughout the research process field notes were used to track information not readily available through data transcriptions. These notes were recorded in written form during observations at the workshops, immediately following each interview, and during the process of data transcription. Field notes offered a way to document specific practices observed during my encounters with the study participants as well as the data. They included descriptions of the settings, actions, and conversations as well as my reflections, questions, and concerns during the research process.

Observations

Observation, particularly participant observation, has been used in a variety of disciplines as a tool for collecting data about people and processes in qualitative research. The main strength of observation is that it provides direct access to the social phenomena under consideration, instead of relying completely on self-report (Polkinghorne, 2005). Organizational identification is a continuous, reciprocal, nonlinear process. It is ever changing, and responsive to its environment (Whetten, 2006). Silva and Sias (2008) suggested that observation is useful when you are trying to understand an ongoing process or situation when you are gathering data in the context of an organization. In this study, observational data provided contextual information needed to make sense of the data collected during the interviews. It helped develop insight into the context, the environment, events, activities, interactions, language used, etc. These insights provided access to a more complete and nuanced understanding of the participants' experiences because they supplemented and clarified data derived from participant interviews.

Interviews

The interviews assisted in gathering specific, descriptive data that detailed the students' self-reflexive accounts of the service they provided in the context of the workshops. Identifications are revealed through language; therefore, detailed accounts of the students' experiences collected in the interviews were a constructive way to gather insights about the processes of identification in which they engaged (Larsen & Pepper, 2003; Tompkins & Cheney, 1983). During the course of an interview conversation, participants discursively construct understanding. In other words, the telling of one's own story becomes an important contributor to identity itself. Larsen and Pepper (2003) stated

that "verbal sense-making that occurs during an interview, especially as participants reflect on their practices, is informed by and also informs the verbal management of identifications in other contexts as participants draw on those contextual resources to provide explanations in an interview" (p. 538). The narratives of identity that were collected during the interviews offer clues as to how people manage multiple identifications in organizations.

The interviews were guided using an open-ended set of questions focused on particular topics of interest while allowing for flexibility. The open-ended format of the interviews allowed the student interviewee to lead the interview, be self-reflexive, and consider their own management of experiences. This format also allowed me the freedom to probe particular issues in depth. First year students as well as returning students were interviewed in order to consider multiple voices and types of experiences within the organization.

A guideline for the interviews (see Appendix E) was constructed by considering an organizational identification measure developed and used by Edwards and Peccei (2007). Building on the work of organizational identification measures proposed by earlier scholars (e.g., Mael & Ashforth, 1992; Miller, Allen, Casey, & Johnson, 2000; Rikketas, 2005), Edwards and Peccei (2007) proposed a way of measuring levels of identification that considers three separate but related factors:

1) the categorization of the self as an organizational member
2) the integration of the organization's goals and values
3) the development of an emotional attachment, belongingness, and membership to an organization

These factors incorporate the main components of organizational identification definitions discussed in research thus far (Edwards & Peccei, 2007). In their 2007 study, Edwards and Peccei found that their three-factor model applied across two independent samples by conducting a confirmatory factor analysis. This suggests that their model has salience and was a useful model to assist in measuring levels of identification in this study.

Interview questions were specifically developed to assist in revealing, in an observable way, the discursive components of participants' experiences. To accomplish this, questions were developed and categorized in three areas using the Edwards and Peccei (2007) model. For example, questions that encouraged participants to self-categorize and label themselves asked participants to describe how they see themselves as members in the organization and discuss organizational membership as part of their identity. Questions that addressed values and goals of the organization asked participants to discuss the values and goals that they share with the organization and consider the ways in which this alignment interacts with their identification with the organization. Questions that addressed belongingness and emotional attachment asked participants to describe their ties with the organization and discuss why their membership is important to them. The information derived from the interviews helped to reveal the meanings about self, other and the organization that were being developed through this engaged participatory activity. The interviews were held in the Language and Communication building on the University of Utah's main campus and were scheduled individually with the students in the week following the second workshop. Interviews were recorded with study participants' permission and transcribed at a later date.

Data Analysis

In keeping with the open-ended, participant guided format used during data collection, the data were analyzed using a variation of Glaser and Strauss's (1967) constant comparison method. Rather than fitting data into predetermined categories, data were assigned to categories that evolved as the data were analyzed. Analysis included noting patterns that emerged that supported previous research as well as patterns that suggested additional study is needed. This method complements my approach to data collection in this study because it is useful in considering data incidents or anecdotes in a situated context (Lindlof & Taylor, 2011).

The analysis of the observation and interview data began by approaching the data holistically. Rather than examining each part separately, I tried to step back and look at the collective qualitative data to see emerging themes. As Strauss (1987) suggested, this stage of data analysis is a process that encourages the researcher to consider all possible interpretations. This approach helped me recognize common themes and interesting stories that emerged around specific items in the data, as well as deviations from these themes.

The categories that emerged resulted in the development of three overarching themes. Knowing that I wanted to explore each theme in the findings section of this thesis, I looked at participant utterances from the interviews to see how "the terms used by social actors to characterize their own scene" (Lindlof & Taylor, 2011, p. 251) fit into each theme. Following this process the themes were explored in relation the purpose of the study which was to uncover the communicative strategies and tactics that undergraduate students use to manage and develop identification with the John R. Park

Debate Society in order to inform understanding of the ways in which students make sense of their identification processes while participating in a particular educationally purposeful activity (Larsen & Pepper, 2003). Participants' meaning making attached to each theme revealed a common story line and is described in detail in the next section.

Researcher in Writing

I am implicated in this research because of my personal and professional investment in teaching, learning, and higher education. In my current positions as graduate student and Director of Outreach for The John R. Park Debate Society, I am conscious of my own identities. As a member of the John R. Park Debate Society staff, my experiences with and expectations of the undergraduate student members of the team influence my perceptions. I also have a vested interest in the program's success and in learning about how students negotiate their experiences within it. Additionally, as a current graduate student, I have opinions and perceptions on the subject of identification within academic organizations based on my own experiences. Both of these roles influenced how I selected, organized, and interpreted the information that I rendered important to this project.

Cooks (2003) wrote that, "identity positions, while having actual material consequences, can also be reworked and rewritten to make visible the constraints themselves" (p. 247). It is important to recognize my positionality in relationship to this research because it influenced how I interacted with the participants, analyses, interpretations, and results of this project. I do not want to hide my position in the writing but instead be transparent about where I am located in the research. Increasing my

awareness about my own positionality more clearly distinguishes where study participants' voices are located in the writing.

Participants in Writing

The analysis of the data collected during this study included excerpts directly quoting the participants. This research intended to increase understanding about student perceptions of identification in academic organizations as it relates to educationally purposeful activities. As such, the analysis was derived directly from the individual interviews and observational interactions held with each participant. Their stories, perspectives, and voices have been consistently in my mind as I have analyzed, written, and re-written. The analysis would be incomplete and inappropriate if I did not allow the reader to hear the same voices that I heard during the interviews (Leslie, 2012). The participants involved in this study are unique individuals who are actively engaged in processes of identification related to their membership in the John R. Park Debate Society. Processes of identification are complex and involve the dynamic linking of organizational roles and activities to one's identity; therefore, the understandings that emerged from this research are directly dependent on the narratives of the participants.

CHAPTER 5

FINDINGS

Consistent with research findings from Ashforth and Mael (1989) and Rooney et al. (2010), participants in this study aligned themselves with the John R. Park Debate Society because the activities that the organization engages in resonated with salient aspects of their personal identities. Students also expressed loyalty to and pride in the group and its activities. As other scholars have noted, performing activities that are required by participants' membership in the organization seemed to be an important part of the participant's processes of identifying with the organization. (Ashforth et al., 2008; O'Reilly & Chatman, 1986). Similar to Tinto's (1997) findings, this study also suggested that identification with the organization was enhanced not only when students were actively involved in learning but when they participated in activities that asked them to share learning in some positive concrete manner.

Study results suggested that teaching at the high school workshops provided a unique context in which students engaged in the process of organizational identification. In particular, because of the ongoing reflection and reframing engendered by their experiences participating in multiple roles on the team, participants' meaning making illustrated growth in personal identity as well as identification with the organization through their roles of teaching at the workshop. There are three key themes that interact

with and underlie this core story line: the alignment of personal and organizational values, participation in multiple roles, and, stemming from the multiple role theme, volunteer teaching as a different and distinct role. Each of these themes is described using participants' own words. Further, the themes are explored in relation to the development of identification with the organization because the results of this study suggested that students discover, develop and describe their organizational identification differently in the context of teaching.

Alignment of Personal Identity and Organizational Values

The first theme that emerged described the reasons participants chose to become members of the John R. Park Debate Society. This theme did not distinctly relate to participation in the workshops but related in a larger way to all of the activities in which organizational members participate. It is important to discuss this theme in this findings section because it was a point of conversation that emerged from every interview. It informed the students' positions as organizational members and illustrated the ways they experienced organizational activities. Most importantly, it was a starting point in revealing the importance of autonomy in organizational membership that proved to be a significant part of the other themes and was particularly relevant to the overall findings of this study.

Organizational identification has been explained by many scholars as an alignment of individual and group values (Pratt, 1998). In this study, students' alignment of personal identity with the organization's goals and values was important and proved to be an ongoing theme throughout the interviews. Participants discussed the many ways they valued the organization, what it stands for, as well as how and why they chose to

become members. For example, Morgan said, "the UofU is a really cool school, and so to be at a really great institution coupled with an activity that I really like… I don't know, for me that is really, well, cool! I value so many things about debate, so having it be a part of my college experience is, I guess, really a privilege."

Initially, most participants discussed what they considered to be values of the larger debate community or values attached to the practice of debate, these included: the development of communication skills, competition, the study of philosophy, service work, leadership, and open discussion of ideas and arguments. Dave suggested, "[the practice of debate] promotes so many important things, like skills and values that our society really needs, integrity, humility, respect, leadership… there are so many." Participants indicated that these values were important to them personally and that they chose to participate in the debate community at the University level because they wanted to practice these values in a constructive forum. Nathan explained it this way, "I identify with [debate as a practice] in terms of not only a character building exercise, but an exercise in academia and the part of myself that is communication oriented and philosophical."

However, as I probed further during the interviews and students reflected on the idea of value alignment, it became apparent that the alignment of values is much deeper for most of them than simply relating to the activity of debate itself. Students suggested that the John R. Park Debate society offered a place where they were free to be individuals, to explore, and to come to their own conclusions. Mary's voice was strong in this suggestion, she said, "I think acceptance is a huge part of the U of Us team, just creating a home for people to... no matter who they are or what they identify as... to be

able to come safely into a space where I feel like I can talk and be heard and listened to. And I really appreciate that on the team." Nathan offered a similar sentiment, "[The team] isn't somewhere where they just identify with people that think the same way but they have access to resources, no matter what way they think, they can investigate it and strengthen their own belief."

During the workshops, I observed Mary and Nathan working to create the type of safe space that allowed for exploration, that they each described during their interviews. They encouraged the high school students to participate by suggesting that there were "no wrong answers" and by taking time to talk through each comment offered by the high school students with the larger group. They made an effort to validate each student's opinions and discussed comments in a neutral tone that did not suggest any judgments were being made. They never implied that one answer or opinion was more correct than another, but rather let all opinions have space in the room and encouraged the high school students to explore at their own pace.

These findings support self-determination or autonomy as an integral part of organizational identification. SIT describes a delicate balance between being both distinctive and nondistinctive as a member of a group and also suggests that members of groups not only work to identify with the larger group, they simultaneously participate in a communicative process of defining themselves as individuals within the organization (Brown & Starkey, 2000; Hatch & Shultz, 2002; Rooney et al, 2010). Mary and Nathan's statements during their interviews and their teaching strategies observed during the workshops, describe the value of engaging with the process of identifying themselves as individuals within the larger organization. Dave added to this idea by describing how the

John R. Park Debate Society offered him the opportunity to "find himself." He suggested that being a member of the team has helped him to "affirm and accept himself" by providing an organizational culture that accepts "differences and intersections" among its members. In all, these findings affirm the suggestions of SIT by describing how and why the study participants valued the culture of autonomy that they perceived existed alongside their group membership.

These findings also suggest that participants in this study were able to access autonomy within their organizational membership through their perceptions of larger organizational values. More specifically, participants described the organization as a "safe" place, that "accepts and celebrates difference," and "welcomes exploration." Their interview discussions suggested that within this atmosphere they felt comfortable exploring their individual identities. As a whole the interviews and observations seem to indicate that opportunity for personal discovery in the context of a safe space was important to participants' development of organizational identification.

Debate as a practice was described by the participants as the vehicle for development of personal identification within the context of the "safe" organizational space. Participants explained that, by nature, the practice of debate encourages people to develop their own viewpoints and situate themselves as individuals within various contexts. For example, Dave described debate as "process work" that "makes me aware of gaps in my understanding, you know, it forces you to consider like a broader perspective about things…somehow that makes me understand my own perspective more, I guess…or maybe change it." Morgan said that as she is working on developing arguments and sorting through evidence, the process inadvertently informs her personal

perspectives, she explained, "you know, when you're like working through things with coaches or the other people on the team, you end up like really figuring out where you stand in like your opinions and like who you are or who you want to be." In total, the data suggest that the challenging process of debate work seems instrumental in the development of autonomy within the context of the academic organization.

Five of the 6 participants strongly supported this theme, but there was slight pushback to the suggestion that the organization provided opportunity for autonomy from 1 of the participants. Robert discussed during his interview that he overwhelmingly felt that the organization was compatible with his identity "politically and ideologically" and that he proudly identified himself as "a debater." He suggested that he appreciated that the opportunities that being a team member allowed him to "develop his own opinions," which echoes the other students sentiments about opportunity for autonomy, however, he also discussed that did not like that team membership required participation in activities that did not interest him. He said, "I'm not sure how much I agree with making everybody do IEs [individual events], I don't think that's important, or necessary." This suggests that although the organization promotes the development of autonomy in many ways it may also inadvertently restrict it through the requirements of membership. In other words, there may be spaces within the organization that are restrictive in terms of autonomy for some members.

I suspect that other participants in this study and other members of the John R. Park Debate Society may have similar feelings related to various requirements of team membership. My position in the study and in relation to the students in the organization may have some influence on the lack of other examples during the interviews. However,

in the case of Robert described above, being required to participate in an activity he was not interested in, although frustrating, did not seem to have a strong influence in how he related to and identified with the team's goals and values or how he perceived the opportunities for individual identification that the team presented. He later said that he could "appreciate" individual events and "respected" other students who enjoyed them, he simply wished it was not a requirement of membership.

Participation in Multiple Roles

A second theme that emerged from the data was a discussion of the ways in which participation in multiple roles constituted organizational membership. Wenger (1998) suggested that a central source of identity formation in organizations is participation. The participants in this study unanimously used the roles they perform as members of the John R. Park Debate Society to explain their membership. When asked to describe themselves as members of the forensics team, participants did so by explaining the different roles they perform; roles like competitor, teammate, representative of the team and the university, volunteer, teacher, mentor, student, and leader were common descriptions among participants. During his interview, Dave explained his membership on the team this way, "I would describe my membership in sort of three ways, the first would be my role in high school outreach, which is giving my labor as a resource to struggling programs and/or new debaters. My second would be as a competitor and to maintain competitive excellence through hard work and research. And, my third would be [participating in] public events, and communication between the team and the larger community." During the workshops, I also observed participants using their roles on the team to describe their membership to high school students. Some of the students in

Robert's section asked him what it is like to debate in college and he responded by explaining each of the roles he performs. Though the descriptions varied slightly among participants, they all used similar roles and activities to explain their membership. These roles are most easily described by dividing them into two broader categories of activities or roles which are, activities that constitute being a student member of the team, and activities that constitute being a representative of the team.

Participants indicated that the roles associated with being student members of the John R. Park Debate Society largely contributed to what they considered to be the benefits of organizational membership. In other words, what they believed they "get out of" being a member of the team. These benefits were described by many of the participants as opportunities to explore, to try, to practice, to learn, to be self-reflexive, and to compete. Alison noted the unique opportunity that being an undergraduate student member of the Debate Society provides, "it allows [the opportunity], in an academic setting, to question myself and my convictions, to constantly push myself to do better, and to have goals and things in terms of choices and options." Alison went on to suggest that combining "self-reflexivity" and the goal of "trying to be a better person" in an academic practice was uncommon and had proven to be highly rewarding for her. Morgan suggested that participating as a competitor on the team afforded her the opportunity to put her work into action. She indicated that putting work (research, practice, etc.) into action by sharing it with others both in practice and competition was extremely rewarding on a personal level. Again, she described this as a benefit she derived from being a member of the John R. Park Debate Society.

The importance of autonomy carried through the participants' discussions around

organizational roles. Alison and Morgan's statements indicated that the roles they participate in encourage "self-reflexivity" and give them spaces in which they can push themselves, question themselves, develop goals, and as Alison put it, try "to be a better person." This suggests that while participating in organizational activities students are not just working to identify and align with the group they are simultaneously developing individual identification. More importantly, participants considered this a benefit of organizational membership.

Wenger (1998) suggested that processes of participation provide the experiences and materials that are necessary for building identities both individually and collectively. The role of being a student representative was the second general category of activities or roles that emerged from the interviews. These roles constituted participation in high school outreach activities and team events outside of competition, as well as the ways in which participants described how they portrayed themselves as organizational members to outsiders. Participants indicated that the role of student representative constituted what they contributed or "gave" to the team. Their reflections suggested, however, that they also derived many personal benefits from being student representatives and that the role of student representative significantly impacted their identification with the organization.

Postmes (2003) considered the idea that perceptions of shared social identity provide organizational members with multiple motivations for communicating a positive message about the organization with which they identify. Several participants in this study indicated that they felt a responsibility and/or obligation to be a positive representative of the team and of the university. They suggested that it was important to them that outsiders viewed the John R. Park Debate Society in a positive way. For

example, Mary stated, "I hope that people see me as someone who is very supportive of debate as an activity, but I also try to uphold the values of the team that we talked about earlier." She went on to say that, "I want people to see the team as something that is very positive." Morgan suggested that, "When I interact with people who aren't on the debate team, I still think of [my identity as a team member] as what I bring to that group." She reflected during the interview about what that meant to her and said, "I hope that I can exude a presence [as a member of the debate team] that people respect and can look up to." These statements suggest student members of the John R. Park Debate Society are invested in reputation of the organization.

The Workshop and Identification

As students reflected on the various ways they contribute to the organization, a more specific conversation and third theme emerged around their participation in high school outreach and specifically, the ways in which teaching in a workshop contributed to identification. As the interview conversations progressed, every participant noted a significant difference between teaching at the workshop and all other activities and roles that constituted their organizational membership. This difference was multifaceted but seemed to result from a desire to share their positive experiences in debate with others. For example, Alison suggested, "almost every single person on the debate team, that at least I've talked to, has a story [that describes how] 'debate completely changed my life, debate helped me gain access to things and opportunities that I otherwise wouldn't have.' I think it's really important to give that to other people." Dave echoed this feeling by stating, "[Debate] has kind of been my bootstraps in life so to speak, you know, the thing that pulls you up. When I was struggling in high school it helped me find my purpose,

who I am. To me high school outreach is extending that same opportunity that I have had... because forensics is the reason I'm at university... to other high school students in what I think is one of the best forms of education."

Some participants expressed an obligation to give back to the communities that they felt once supported them. They expressed that passing on something that has deep meaning and influence in their own lives was very rewarding. For example, Morgan discussed the significance of college student volunteers to her high school debate career. She considered the ways in which college student coaches gave her guidance in debate and life and that her experience in high school debate changed her for the better. She said, "I took a lot from the high school debate community so I feel a really big obligation to give back to it." Robert suggested, "Debate helped to teach me quite a bit throughout high school and probably changed a lot of my opinions on a lot of things, so I'm glad to try to help people be better. I feel like [giving back] is a little bit inherent to the activity on some level." Additionally, Nathan expressed that, "working with high school students is not just something I'm interested in and is fun to do, but also something that is important in supporting the larger community."

Teaching in the workshops not only affirmed the desire or obligation to "pass on" the positive things that forensics provided in the participants' lives, it also proved to be a personally rewarding experience for most participants. Participants expressed feelings of pride and accomplishment when students responded positively to their teaching. Mary said, "I love being with the students and just helping them to understand what debate is and also learning from them and their views. I think that's really rewarding in itself because different perspectives bring different goals and also different successes and so I

think the more we interact with difference the better off we are and so coaching is really fulfilling because of that." Dave suggested that teaching is fulfilling because "you have time to personally interact with students and encourage them."

Participants also expressed disappointment when they felt the high school students did not respond well to their teaching. At the end of the workshops, high school students were asked to fill out a workshop feedback form (see Appendix D for sample). In the section that Dave and Morgan taught, two of the 24 feedback forms collected came back with negative comments. Dave and Morgan were both visibly distressed by this even though the rest of the forms were overwhelmingly positive. They talked with me about wanting to "know the reasons" that students had not responded well to them. They were also concerned about how their coaches and peers would react to this information. This suggests that they took their contribution in the workshop seriously and were invested in the outcomes both personally and as members of the John R. Park Debate Society.

Teaching also seemed to add to and enhance the participants' own learning and understanding. As Tinto (1997) suggested, students found that sharing learning through teaching enhanced their own understanding and perspectives. Alison confirmed this suggestion by saying, "I can't call myself an excellent debater if I can't explain something to someone who doesn't have an understanding. So, [teaching] really helps me check my understandings of things and also be able to articulate them and conceptualize them in a way that's effective for other people. So, really it's a good way to refine my debate skills outside of actually debating because I think that stepping back is really important to becoming a better debater."

The role of teaching in the high school workshop also influenced identification with the John R. Park Debate Society. Teaching informed the identity construction process by generating reflection about the self in relation to the organization (Jones & Abes, 2004). Participants indicated that high school students viewed them as "leaders of the John R. Park Debate Society and of the University of Utah." This seemed to make their identification with both organizations more salient in part because they perceived that others were depending on them to uphold and extend the reputation of the organization and in part because they felt recognized as members of the organization. For example, Mary said, "I think it's important to act as a representative of the team, I try to uphold the values and reputation" and Dave indicated that he wanted high school students to view him personally as "a friend and mentor."

Teaching in the workshops also seemed to provide a context that assisted students in developing a way to internally define their identities rather than relying on others or outside perspectives to inform their identification processes. In other words, it gave them some control over the identity construction process (Jones & Abes, 2004). For example, Morgan suggested that the teaching role provided a way in which she could contribute to the team when she was not competing, or not successfully competing. She suggested that as a freshman member of the team, she often felt as if she "let the team down" in competition but teaching in the workshop provided her a way to contribute to the team in a meaningful way. She noted, "...it's weird transitioning from being the best debater on my team to being a freshman again, teaching and coaching is something I know that I can do well and I know that I have a lot of confidence in, so I feel that I definitely brought something to team when I was able to participate in the workshop."

Others suggested that although they felt proud to be recognized by high school students enrolled in the workshop, as students of the University of Utah and members of the John R. Park Debate Society, they also felt that teaching set them apart from the organization. For example, Dave said, "When I feel that I have directly affected someone's personal confidence, or you know, challenged the way that they view life, that doesn't really make me feel a sense of identity toward or with the team, but more toward myself." In other words, although the experience of teaching took place within the context of their membership in John R. Park Debate Society, it provided them a way to be recognized as a distinct member of the organization. They were able to extend their salient identification with the organization in a way that allowed them to be recognized as individuals.

Although the 6 participants overwhelmingly viewed teaching in the workshops as a positive experience that influenced them on a personal level, there were 2 students that expressed concerns and issues related to teaching. Robert discussed that he experienced some self-doubt related to performing the teaching role, he said, "I don't think I looked the most prepared [when I was teaching]…actually, I was like totally unprepared to be giving a lecture on how these debate arguments functioned. I thought the student's response would be like 'you guys don't know anything about debate.'" He went on to explain that despite his insecurities, the workshop went well, "they [the high school students] seemed to react positively, so I assume that I probably came off knowledgeable, hopefully. They certainly seemed to get something out of it."

Nathan's interview revealed some tensions in terms of the time and effort that he was required to put into the workshop. He described teaching as an experience that was

"very fulfilling" and was eager to talk about why he enjoyed working with the high school students but he also indicated that he felt the high school outreach obligation was an expectation of team membership that was difficult. He said, "I found that we had a lot placed on us, like they [the coaching staff] had us prepare demo debates and drills and lecturing. The workshop wasn't long enough to cover everything that we prepared for so I felt like there was a lot of extra, unnecessary work… time constraints are hard, I know we need to be prepared, but I guess better pre-planning would have been nice."

Despite these tensions, participants revealed some significant data in terms of identification both with the organization and individually related to their participation in the workshops. Participants suggested that they felt high school students held the John R. Park Debate Society in high regard. For example, Dave said, "I think [high school students] think that our team is a lot more exclusive than it really is by the way that they talk to it and I think it's just like the culture that high schools have created and talk about it, like universities are like a very exclusive thing, which they are, but they kind of have an exaggerated sense of that. But they pretty much view our team as prestigious and as community leaders and I think it's great that we like have that image." Mary noted, "[High school students] view the team as community leaders within the debate community both in high school as well as college. I think they see the team as something that is very positively trying to engage people in debate and I think that students in the debate community really look up to us." These sentiments suggest that participants are proud to be recognized as members of the John R. Park Debate Society by high school students because they perceive that their membership is recognized positively. This association creates a stable context in which autonomy can exist.

Similar to the practice of debate, the practice of teaching in the workshops provided a vehicle for developing and demonstrating autonomy within the organizational context. Students were able to perform as individuals while being represented as organizational members. This seemed to be particularly supportive to the process of maintaining the balance between being distinct and nondistinct as an organizational member that SIT describes (Brown & Starkey, 2000). Dave said, "students, you know say things that kind of make me proud and uncomfortable at the same time only because a lot of us don't know how to take compliments, like 'oh man, like you're the best, please teach me how to be like you' and you're thinking in your head, you're like wow it's weird that someone wants to me like me, but I guess it makes me feel good about what I'm doing and like makes me know that all the hard work I do like sort-of reflects through me…I don't know if that makes sense." This sentiment describes processes of identification in a way that is different from identification in other roles because it offered students the opportunity to promote or display their individual identification to people outside of the organization. Recognition of individual identity by outsiders seemed validating to the students.

CHAPTER 6

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of the study was to expose the communicative strategies and tactics that undergraduate students use to manage and develop identification with the John R. Park Debate Society in order to inform understanding of the ways in which different educationally purposeful activities affect identification within academic organizations (Larsen & Pepper, 2003). Participation in educationally purposeful activities seems to trigger organizational identity development and this study sought to clarify the details and nuances of organizational identification among members of the John R. Park Debate Society in relation to their participation in educationally purposefully activities. Understanding the ways that participation in educationally purposeful activities interacts with organizational identification within academic organizations is important in understanding student engagement because research suggests that identification with an academic organization promotes academic integration, which is key to predicting college student success and preventing college student drop out.

The findings in this study suggest that all participants developed salient identifications with the John R. Park Debate Society. This strong identification was revealed through dialog with the students during the interviews that described the ways in which their membership was important to them and operationalized through the activities and roles they participated in as organizational members. Autonomy emerged as a key

underling theme in all the data collected and analyzed. The organization and the activities and practices within it seemed to support autonomy among its members in many ways for example, several students discussed the way that the practice of debate supports personal exploration and consideration of multiple perspectives.

The specific activity of teaching in a workshop, however, was described differently by participants than other activities in terms of developing a distinctive identity that translated outside of the organization. The data examined did not specifically suggest that teaching in the context of the high school workshops contributed to a stronger or more salient identification with the organization than other activities did, but it did indicate that it supported the development of organizational identification in that it offered a unique space for the expansion of autonomy within organizational membership and more importantly the recognition of that autonomy by people outside the organization. This seemed to be related to the ways in which the workshop allowed students to represent their own identification with the organization to outsiders. For example, Mary discussed during her interview that beyond being recognized as a member of a successful collegiate debate team during the workshops, she wanted the high school students in the workshops to recognize her individually. She reflected, "I hope students don't just see me as a college debater, but that they see me as a mentor, and as a friend, and as someone who challenges them and pushes them to be better, but also someone who is there for them in the difficult aspects of debate, which are many." As SIT suggests, while it is important for organizational members to be recognized as belonging to an organization, it is equally important for them to be distinct (Brown & Starkey, 2000). By nature, the workshops offered the participants a space in which they could be

recognized as belonging to the John R. Park Debate Society, but unlike some of the other activities and spaces that membership offered, it allowed them to be recognized individually and to have more control over the ways in which they perform their identification. Mary continued, "Of course, I try to act as a positive representative of the team, and I want to be a good representative of the team, but I also want to develop a connection that is more personal, that goes beyond that, you know?" Dave more explicitly discussed how teaching affects him individually, "[teaching in the workshops] adds to my identity as self, because, you know for a moment, I feel that I have directly affected someone's personal confidence, or you know, challenged the way that they view life. That doesn't make me feel a sense of identity toward the team, but more toward myself."

Teaching in the workshops supported the extension of participants' salient identities with the John R. Park Debate Society beyond simply being recognized as organizational members because they identified teaching as a practice that was distinct from other roles. Participants indicated feeling a sense of pride and accomplishment in teaching that was different than the sense of pride and accomplishment they felt after a successful competition because they felt it was lasting and that their efforts continued beyond a tournament, or season, or even debate career. For example, Morgan said, "teaching is different [than other activities], it feels different, there is overlap because we do it all as team members but teaching isn't competition, you don't just do it and leave and the results are the results and 5 years later nobody cares, you are actually doing something that may affect someone's life directly." Alison noted the results of teaching go beyond "just winning a round" in competition. She discussed, "I find teaching the most fulfilling, particularly because we have that time. We have the time that I can explain and

we can practice and see. That's what I really liked is having so much time with those kids that I can actually see them, you know, *do*, execute the skills that I am teaching them and see them become better." She went on to talk about how personally rewarding that was for her.

In total, the findings of this study suggest the significance of autonomy on organizational identification and the importance of organizational roles and activities that support the development of autonomy. Scholars have discussed that maintaining a balance between being both distinctive and nondistinctive as a group member is necessary for organizational identification to occur (Brown & Starkey, 2000; Rooney et al, 2010). Many of the roles and practices that the participants in this study engaged with as members of the John R. Park Debate Society offered opportunities for students to continuously develop and maintain this balance, however, teaching in the context of the workshops was different because it was a vehicle to extend their identifications beyond the organization. It is unclear from the findings of this study whether extension of identification beyond the organization affects organizational identification in a way that affects academic integration, but it is clear that participants overwhelmingly wanted to discuss why it was important to them personally. This realization prompts me to consider the Baxter Magolda (1999) theory of self-authorship and suggest that future studies consider it in relation to organizational identification.

According to Baxter Magolda (1999), self-authorship allows for personal authority over one's identity through "an ability to contract knowledge in a contextual world, an ability to construct an internal identity separate from external influences, and an ability to engage in relationships without losing one's internal identity" (Baxter

Magolda, 1999, p. 12). She suggests that service-learning opportunities tend to promote self-reflection, personal awareness, and scrutiny of certain aspects of identity previously taken for granted. She also asserts that promoting students development toward self-authorship, which depends on the integration of cognitive complexity, interpersonal maturity and interpersonal identity development, is one of the primary goals of higher education. Future research may aim to explore how different organizational roles support or interfere with this process and how different experiences inform identification processes within and beyond organizational membership.

Limitations

The goal of this research was to obtain insights into the ways in which educationally purposeful activities affect organizational identification in academic groups in higher education. I intentionally limited my analysis to a singular academic organization, the John R. Park Debate Society, and to member discourse within it that represented organizational identification in relation to educationally purposeful activities. Demonstrating how individuals continually and communicatively negotiate their identities through participation in organizational activities is difficult to analyze across more than one organization because of the negotiated and dynamic nature of identification. Silva and Sias (2008) suggested that identification is expressed via narrative and other behaviors in varied contexts or locales of social interaction, usually to those and with those who are copresent. Identification is not a static process; rather, it is an ongoing story individuals tell about themselves within specific contexts. Exploring the research questions in this single context was useful in developing a clear understanding of distinct participatory activities as they relate to organizational identification. Although

this was mostly a benefit to the study, the situated nature of the data for this study may have several limitations.

Forensics organizations are unique academic groups that contain a unique group of members. Croucher and colleagues (2009) suggested that the competitive and intellectual nature of forensics students may affect an individual's identification process. Members of forensics teams are most often involved students with generally higher grade point averages than the average student body and these students are typically more competitive than the average student (Rogers, 2002). It is possible many of these students' cognitive, emotional, and communicative levels of and demands for organizational identification are higher than those of the general college student population (Croucher et al, 2009). This may make the results of this study more difficult to apply to other college student organizations.

This study is also limited in its focus on only one organization and one type of organization, and, in particular, a voluntary organization that members join primarily due to shared values. This limitation likely accounts for the largely positive tone of the interviews. If there are students who had negative experiences in the John R. Park Debate Society, they likely chose to no longer participate in the organization. In addition, the focus on only one organization may limit the generalizability of the findings. However, members of all types of organizations likely share some of the experiences this study highlights and future research examining these findings in a variety of organization types is suggested.

All of the undergraduate participants in this study came out of high school forensics programs, and this may also be a limitation. Future research should consider

the connection of long term-participation in forensics, specifically the high school forensics experience to the collegiate forensics experience and the ways in which identification with forensics programs is affected. For example, many of the students discussed their own experiences in high school working with college student volunteers. This suggests that they have preconceived ideas about what it means to perform that role. In other words, long-term participation in forensics and previous experience with college students in the role of high school student mentors may have some effect on the way undergraduate students process identification within the high school outreach volunteer role(s) and on the ways they identify with the John R. Park Debate Society.

Conclusion

This study facilitates bringing together several areas of scholarship under the umbrella of organizational identification. Examining organizational identification through the lens of participatory service learning in intercollegiate forensics stands to support and facilitate greater knowledge not only in the understanding of how identification is created in organizations but also in understanding educationally purposeful engagement, college student development, participatory learning practices, service learning, etc.

Specifically, this study attempted to make a contribution to the research regarding student engagement as it relates to college student success by examining student sense making processes while engaging in an educationally purposeful activity and how those sense making processes reveal aspects of organizational identity. Understanding the ways that participation in educationally purposeful activities interacts with organizational identification within academic organizations is important in understanding student engagement because research suggests that identification with an academic organization

promotes academic integration which key to predicting college student success and preventing college student drop out. Although there are limitations to this study, this research adds to scholarship by highlighting communicative processes of sense making during engagement that shape individuals identification within the larger organization when they are participating in service learning. The focus on the communicative experiences of students involved in an organizational identification process expands knowledge of how students make sense of their own identification processes and will support educational institutions in structuring educationally purposeful activities that enhance engagement and diminish the likelihood of dropping out of college. These findings can also inform and act as starting points for understanding identification in other on-campus, academic organizations.

APPENDIX A

HIGH SCHOOLS REPRESENTED AT WORKSHOPS

American Fork High School, American Fork, UT

Bountiful High School, Bountiful, UT

Cottonwood High School, Salt Lake City, UT

Copper Hills High School, West Jordan, UT

Hillcrest High School, Salt Lake City, UT

Juab High School, Juab, UT

Juan Diego Catholic High School, Draper, UT

Judge Memorial Catholic High School, Salt Lake City, UT

Park City High School, Park City, UT

Rowland Hall, Salt Lake City, UT

Roy High School, Roy, UT

Salem Hills High School, Salem, UT

Summit Academy, Bluffdale, UT

Syracuse High School, Syracuse, UT

Taylorsville High School, Taylorsville, UT

Viewmont High School, Bountiful, UT

Woods Cross High School, Woods Cross, UT

APPENDIX B

WORKSHOP SCHEDULE

4:00 - Welcome

4:15 - Divide into groups

4:20-5:30 - Lecture & drills

5:30-6:00 - Dinner break

6:00-7:00 - Demonstration debates

APPENDIX C

SAMPLE LESSON PLAN

Section 1: Gender Lecture (4:15-4:45 pm)

1. Gender, Sexuality and Identity

2. Identity and Gender We need to examine the following two claims: Gender identities are shaped by many different factors – individual and collective: biological and social The ways we construct our identities are strongly influenced by a set of rather stereotypically feminine and masculine characteristics and traits that we often associate with gender categories.

3. Definitions? Sex is a biological classification Gender includes the social attributes associated with being a man or a woman in a particular society. Feminine/masculine These are terms applied to the qualities particular societies associate with women and men.

4. The OED [gen-der] 1. Grammar. 1. a. A set of two or more categories, as masculine, feminine, and neuter, into which words are divided according to sex, animation, psychological associations, or some other characteristic, and that determine agreement with or the selection of modifiers, referents, or grammatical forms. 1. b. One category of such a set. 1. c. The classification of a word or grammatical form in such a category. 1. d. The distinguishing form or forms used. 2. Classification of sex. [sex] 1. a. The property or quality by which organisms are classified according to their reproductive functions. 1. b. Either of two divisions, designated male and female, of this classification. 2. Males or females collectively. 3. The condition or character of being male or female; the physiological, functional, and psychological differences that distinguish the male and the female. 4. The sexual urge or instinct as it manifests itself in behavior. 5. Sexual intercourse. 6. The genitalia.

5. Positions From a recent medical text Taken as a noun, sex is a biological determinant, while gender carries psychological and sociological implications. Hence in biological sciences, sex differences are innate, chromosomally determined characteristics that distinguish between males and females, while in psychological and sociological sciences gender differences refer to male or female traits that result from learning and social roles.

6. Positions Another quote, from a book entitled Gender Voices: The opening words of Simone de Beauvoir's historic book The Second Sex capture the essential characteristic of gender: 'One is not born, but rather becomes, a woman.' Gender is a socially rather than a biologically constructed attribute -- people are not born with but rather learn the behaviours and attitudes appropriate to their sex. During the last decade of research, it has become clear that gender is a very complex category. Theories are still being developed which try to grapple with the complexity but they share the idea that gender, unlike sex, is a continuous variable. A person can be more or less 'feminine' and more or less 'masculine.' Furthermore, a man can display 'feminine' characteristics just as a woman may demonstrate 'masculine' ones.

7. Table 1 Table 1 contains 45 terms which might be used to categorize people. Which, if any, of these words would you use to describe yourself?

8. Table 2 Table 2: Typically feminine and typically masculine characteristics. (Woodward, 2000)

10. Gender Identity and Self-categorization (Turner et. al. 1987) We see people as members of social categories We also see ourselves as members of social categories We take on identities appropriate to the social categories with which we identify.

11.. Gender Identity and Self-Categorization What happens when a child is born? What category, male or female will be written on the birth certificate? What factors, biological or social, influence this categorization?
12. Gender Identity and Self-Categorization Gender as socially constructed? Are we free to change our gender identity? Gender stereotypes Masculinities and femininities

13. Gender Identity and Self-Categorization: Bem (1995) Feminine Femininity Undifferentiated Masculinity Masculine Androgynous

Section 2: Public Forum Skills (4:45 – 5:15 pm)

1. 4:45 – 5:00
    a. Public Forum as an exercise in non-flow persuasion
    b. Rebuttals to maximize persuasion
    c. Debating in an increasingly policy-style format
2. 5:00-5:15
    a. Two point structures
    b. Clarifying an inherently messy structure (making rebuttals make sense)
    c. “Impacts” in P

Section 3: Drills and Exercises (5:15 – 5:30 pm)

5 minutes of Vocal Warm Ups
Speaking Drills
1. Over enunciation

2. Pencil in Mouth
3. Reading Backwards
4. “And”
5. Vowels
6. Rebuttal Regives
7. Endurance Drills
8. Four Point Refutations
9. Stop Starts
    a. Any time a student uses a filler phrase like, “at the point that which” you stop them and start them from the beginning.

10. Count Down
    a. Competitors give speech starting with 4 minutes, then 3, then 2, then 1

DINNER BREAK

Section 4: Example Debate (6:00 – 6:45 pm)

1. Anybody want to volunteer?
    a. Focusing on what was presented
    b. Post-round discussion to understand skills and tips for future success

Pre-round questions:

1. How are the case impacts being presented?
2. Are the rebuttals repeating the constructive or bringing new evidence?
3. Is the summary making the key arguments clear and which are unresponded to?
4. Does the final focus give a clear voter for the round? Are the impacts weighed or simply restated?

Wrap-Up (6:45 – 7:00 pm)

Any last questions? Future contact?

APPENDIX D

WORKSHOP FEEDBACK FORM

2014 Utah Forensics High School Workshop - Feedback Form

Please use the following scale to answer items 1-3. You may circle your answer.

1= Very Poor

2= Poor

3= Average

4= Above Average

5= Excellent

1. Please rate the quality of instruction:

   1 2 3 4 5

2. Please rate the quality of the free materials, e.g., evidence & cases:

   1 2 3 4 5

3. Please rate your overall experience:

   1 2 3 4 5

4. How likely are you to attend a future clinic? (Select N/A if you are a graduating senior)

   N/A Very Likely Unlikely Likely Very Likely

5. Please identify up to three things you would like for us to add to future clinics:

   1.

2.

3.

6. Open Feedback (Please share with us any thoughts you have about your experience or how to improve the clinic in the future):

APPENDIX E

INTERVIEW QUESTION GUIDELINE

Tell me what it's like to be a member of the John R. Park Debate Society.

What drew you to the organization?

How does being a member of the team inform your college experience?

From your perspective how would you describe the goals and values of the John R. Park Debate Society (as an organization)?

Do you think your personal values and goals line up with the team's? Why or why not? Which ones? Examples?

Tell me about the different roles and activities you perform as a member of the team.

What does team membership require of you?

What roles do you enjoy the most/least? Why? Examples?

What is it like to represent the team in these different roles? How does it feel? Are the roles different?

In thinking about your participation in the various aspects of our high school outreach program (for example, volunteer judging, coaching/teaching at the workshop):

What do you find the most fulfilling?

What is the most challenging?

What best supports your personal goals and values, if any? Why & How?

Examples?

How do you think high school debate students viewed you when you were teaching at the workshop?

How do you think high school debate students view the John R. Park Debate Society during the workshops (and otherwise) How did you feel when you were teaching at the workshop?

How is teaching at the workshop different than the other roles you have as a member of the team?

What does it mean to you to identify with an organization, specifically the John R. Park Debate Society?

REFERENCES

Aden, R. C. (2002). Reconsidering the laboratory metaphor: Forensics as a liberal art. *The National Forensic Journal, 20,* 2-12.

Albert, S., Ashforth, B. & Dutton, J. (2000). Organizational identity and identification: Charting new waters and building new bridges. *Academy of Management Review, 25*(1), 13-17.

Albert, S. & Whetten, D. A. (1985). Organizational Identity. In L. L. Cummings and M. M. Staw Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (pp. 263-295). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Ashforth, B. E., Harrison, S. H., & Corley, K. G. (2008). Identification in organizations: An examination of four fundamental questions. *Journal of Management, 34,* 325-374.

Ashforth, B.E., & Johnson, S.A. (2001). Which hat to wear? The relative salience of multiple identities in organizational contexts. In M.A. Hogg & D.J. Terry (Eds.), *Social identity processes in organizational contexts,* 31-48. Philadelphia: Psychology Press.

Ashforth, B. E., & Mael, F. (1989). Social identity theory and the organization. *The Academy of Management Review, 14*(1), 20-39.

Astin, A.W. (1993). *What matters in college: Four critical years revisited*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bartels, J., Peters, O., de Jong, M., Pruyn, A., & van der Molen, M. (2010). Horizontal and vertical communication as determinants of professional and organizational identification. *Personnel Review, 39, 210-226.*

Baxter Magolda, M. B. (1999). *Creating contexts for learning and self-authorship: Constructive-developmental pedagogy*. Nashville, TN: Vanderbuilt University Press

Baxter Magolda, M. G. (2000). Interpersonal maturity: Integrating agency and communication. *Journal of College Student Development, 41, 141-156.*

Bean, J. P. (1983). The application of a model of turnover in work organizations to the student attrition process. *Review of Higher Education, 6, 129-148*.

Berger, I. E., Cunningham, P. H., & Drumwright, M. E. (2006). Identity, identification, and relationship social alliances. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 34*(2),*128-137*.

Billett, S. (2001). Learning throughout working life: Interdependencies at work. *Studies in Continuing Education, 23*(1), *19-35*.

Billet, S. (2001). Learning through work: Workplace affordances and individual engagement. *Journal of Workplace Learning, 13*(5), 209-214.

Brand, J. E. & Xie, Y. (2010). Evidence for negative selection in heterogeneous economic returns to higher education. *American Sociological Review, 75*(2), *273-302*.

Braxton, J. M., Vesper, N., & Hossler, D. (1995). Expectations for college and student persistence. *Research in Higher Education, 36*(5), *595-612*.

Brown, M. V. (2007). Organizational identity theory revisited: Toward Conceiving a new analytic model. *NCS 93rd Annual Convention Paper*. 1-28.

Brown, A. D. & Starkey, K. (2000). Organizational identity and learning: A psychodynamic perspective. *Academy of Management Review, 25,* 102-120.

Cabrera, Casteneda, & Hengstler, D. (1992). The convergence between two theories of college student persistence. *Journal of Higher Education, 63*(2), *143-164*.

Cheney, G. (1983). On the various changing meanings of organizational membership: A field study in organizational identification. *Communication Monographs, 50,* 342-362.

Cheney, G., & Christensen, L. T. (2001). Organizational identity. In F. M. Jablin & L.L. Putnam (Eds.), *The new handbook of organizational communication: Advances in theory, research, and methods* (pp.231-269). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cheney, G., Christensen, L. T., Zorn, T. E. Jr., & Ganesh, S. (2004). *Organizational communication in an age of globalization: Issues, reflections, practices*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland.

Cheney, G. & Tompkins, P. (1987). Coming to terms with organizational identification and commitment. *Central States Speech Journal, 38*(1), *1-15*.

Chickering, A.W., & L. Reisser. (1993). Education and Identity. 2nd ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cooks, L. (2003). Pedagogy, performance, and positionality: Teaching about Whiteness in interracial communication. *Communication Education*, *52*(3⁄4), 245-257.

Croucher, S. M., Long, B. L., Meredith, M. J., Oommen, D., & Steele, E. L. (2009). Factors predicting organizational identification with intercollegiate forensics teams. *Communication Education*. *58*(1), 74-91.

Croucher, S. M., Thornton, T., & Eckstein, E. M. (2006). Organization identity, culture and student motivation among intercollegiate forensics competitors. *National Forensics Journal*. *24*(1), 1-16.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2000). The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & U. S. Lincoln (Eds), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 1-28). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Edwards, M. R., & Peccei, R. (2007). Organizational identification: Development and testing of a conceptually grounded measure. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 16,* 25-37.

Edwards, M. R., & Peccei, R. (2010). Perceived organizational support, organizationalidentification, and employee outcomes: Testing a simultaneous multifoci model. *Journal of Personal Psychology 9*(1), *17-26*.

Freeley, A. J., & Steinberg, D. L. (2000). *Argumentation and debate*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Glaser, B. G. & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago: Aldine Publishers.

Gordon, V., Habley, W., & Grites, T. (Eds.) (2011). *Academic advising: A Comprehensive handbook* (2nd edition), (pp. 424-430). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin, & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 105-117). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hatch, M. J. & Schultz, M. (2002). The dynamics of organizational identity. *Human Relations, 55,* 989-1018.

Hui, C., Law, K. S., & Chen, Z. X. (1999). A structural equation model of the effects of negative affectivity, leader-member exchange, and perceived job mobility on in-role and extra-role performance: A Chinese case. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 77,* 3-21.

Jones, S. R., & Abes, E. S. (2004). Enduring influences of service-learning on college student identity development. *Journal of College Student Development, 45*(2), 149-166.

Jones, S. R., & Hill, K. (2001). Crossing high street: Understanding diversity through community service-learning. *Journal of College Student Development, 42, 204-216*.

Kruegar, A. B. (2012). The rise and consequences of inequality in the United States. Washington, DC: Council of Economic Advisors.

Kuh, G. (1993). In their own words: What students learn outside the classroom. *American Educational Research Journal* (30), 277-304.

Kuh, G. D., Cruce, T. M., Shoup, R., Kinzie, J., & Gonyea, R. M. (2008). Unmasking the effects of student engagement on first year college grades and persistence. *Journal of Higher Education*. *79*(5), *540-563*.

Kuh, G. D., Kinzie, J., Buckley, J. A., Bridges, B. K., & Hayek, J. C. (2006). What matters to student success: A review of the literature. *National Post-Secondary Education Cooperative,* July 2006.

Kuh, G., Kinzie, J., Schuh, J. H., & Whitt, E. L. (2010). *Student success in college: Creating conditions that matter*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Larson, G. S., & Pepper, G. L. (2003). Strategies for managing multiple organizational identifications: A case of competing identities. *Management Communication Quarterly, 16*(4), 528-557.

Larson, G. S., & Pepper, G. L. (2011). Organizational identification and the symbolic shaping of technology. *Qualitative Research Reports in Communication, 12*(1), 1-9.

Leslie, K. J. (2012). *Exploring university student perspectives on classroom participation*. University of Utah, Thesis. May 2012.

Lindlof, T. R. & Taylor, B. C. (2011). *Qualitative communication research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Liu, Y., Loi, R., & Lam, L. W. (2011). Linking organizational identification and employee performance in teams: The moderating role of team-member exchange. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 22*(15), 3187-3201.

Mael, F. & Ashforth, B. (1992) Alumni and their alma maters: A partial test of the reformulated model of organizational identification. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 13*, 103-123.

Miller, V. D., Allen, M., Casey, M., Johnson, J. R. (2000). Reconsidering the organizational identification questionnaire. *Management Communication Quarterly*, (13), 628-658.

Mirowsky, J. & Ross, C. E. (2003). *Education, social status, and health*. Somerset, NY: Aldine deGruyter.

O'Reilly, C., & Chatman, J. (1986). Organizational commitment and psychological attachment: The effects of compliance, identification, and internalization on prosocial behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71*, 492-499.

Oreopoulos, P. & Salvanes, K. (2011). Priceless: The nonpecuniary benefits of schooling. *Journal of Economic Literature, 25*(1), *159-184*.

Pascarella, E., & Terenzini, P. (1980). Predicting persistence and voluntary dropout decisions from a theoretical model. *Journal of Higher Education, 51, 60-75*.

Polkinghorne, D. E. (2005). Language and meaning: Date collection in qualitative research. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 52*(2), *137-145*.

Postmes, T. (2003). A social identity approach to communication in organizations. In S. A. Haslam, D. Van Knippenberg, M. J. Platow, & N. Ellemers (Eds.), *Social identity at work: Developing theory for organizational practice* (pp. 81-97). Philadelphia: Psychology Press.

Pratt, M. G. (1998). To be or not to be: Central questions in organizational identification. In D. A. Whetten & P. C. Godfrey (Eds.), *Identity in organizations* (pp. 171–207). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Richardson, J., Long, G., & Woodley, A. (2003). Academic engagement and perceptions of quality in distance education. *Open Learning 18*(3), *223–244*.

Riketta, M. (2005). Organizational identification: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 66*, 358-384.

Rogers, J. E. (2002). Longitudinal outcome for forensics: Does participation in intercollegiate, competitive forensics contribute to measurable differences in positive student outcomes? *Contemporary Argumentation and Debate, 16*, 98-108.

Rogers, J. E. (2005). Graduate school, professional, and life choices: An outcome assessment of confirmation study measuring positive student outcomes beyond student experiences for participants in competitive intercollegiate forensics. *Contemporary Argumentation and Debate, 26,* 13-40.

Rooney, D., Paulsen, N., Callan, V. J., Brabant, M., Gallois, C., & Jones, E. (2010). A new role for place identity in managing organizational change. *Management Communication Quarterly, 24*(1), 44-73.

Scott, D., Corman, S., & Cheney, G. (1998). Development of a structurational model of identification in the organization. *Communication Theory, 8*(3), 298-336.

Scott, R. (1995). *Institutions and organizations*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Silva, D., & Sias, P.M. (2008). Connection, restructuring, and buffering: The role of groups in the individual-organizational relationship. *National Communication Association Conference in San Diego, CA*.

Snider, A. & Schnurer, M. (2002). *Many sides, debate across the curriculum*. New York, NY: The International Debate Education Association.

Stryker, S. & Serpe, R. T. (1982). Commitment, identity salience, and role behavior: Theory and research example. In W. Ikes & E. S. Knowles (Eds.), *Personality, roles, and social behavior* (pp. 199-218). New York: Springer-Vehlag.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin, & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33-47)/ Monteray: Brooks/Cole.

Tinto, V. (1993). *Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition (2nd Ed.),* Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Tinto, V. (1997). Learning better together. *Journal of Higher Education, 68*(6).

Tinto, V. & Engstrom, C. M. (1997). Working together for service learning. *About Campus, 2*(3), 10-23.

Tinto, V., & Goodsell-Love, A. (1993). Building community. *Liberal Education, 79*(4).

Tomkins, P. K., & Cheney, G. (1983). *Organizational communication imperatives: Lessons of the space program*. Los Angeles: Roxbury.

Tompkins, P. K., & Cheney, G. (1985). Communication and unobtrusive control. In R. McPhee and P. K. Tompkins, (Eds.), *Organizational communication: Traditional themes and new directions*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Wenger, E. 1998. *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning and identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wenger, E., McDermott, R., & Snyder, M. (2002). *Cultivating communities of practice*. Harvard Business Press.

Whetten, D.A (2006). Albert and Whetten revised. Strengthening the concept of organizational identity. *Journal of Management Inquiry, 15*(3) *219-234*.

Woodward, K. (2000). *Questioning identity: Gender class, nation*. New York, NY: Taylor and Francis.

Youniss, J. & Yates, M. (1997). *Community service and social responsibility in youth*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Zhao, C. & Kuh, D. (2004). Adding value: Learning communities and student engagement. *Research in Higher Education*. *45*(2). 115-138.